

REMARKS

The following is in response to the Office Action dated September 13, 2004, and the Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the claim rejections in this case in light of the following.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 24-28 were pending.

Claims 27 and 28 are cancelled.

Claims 29-31 are newly added.

Accordingly, Claims 24-26 and 29-31 are before the Examiner for consideration.

SECTIONS 1 AND 2 OF OFFICE ACTION

In Sections 1 and 2 of the Office Action, Claims 27-28 were rejected for introducing new and/or unsupported subject matter. Claims 27 and 28 have been cancelled.

SECTION 3 OF OFFICE ACTION

In Section 3 of the Office Action, Figure 3 of the drawings was objected to for showing an impossible configuration, specifically, that the wraps of ribbons around turnbars 232, 270 are not sufficiently spaced apart considering the illustrated configuration. In response, the Applicant respectfully submits that in this instance it is not necessary to specifically show such a feature/characteristic in the drawings.

In particular, as noted in M.P.E.P. § 608.02(d), the general standard for completeness/accuracy in drawings is that “any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be shown in the drawing.”

Here, Figure 3 is, in effect, a schematic drawing. Instead of serving as an illustration of what the present invention would look like in “real life” (which is not a requirement for patent drawings), the components are shown as schematic elements, for illustrating the invention in a system-level, representative sense. As such, all the structural details that are of importance to the invention are shown, and one of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate and understand, given the schematic nature of the drawings, that

precise spatial relationships are not meant to be illustrated, and that in an actual implementation of the invention the spacing of successive ribbon wraps around a turnbar might vary from what is shown in the drawings.

In short, considering that a precise showing of how successive ribbon wraps are spaced is not necessary for understanding how the present invention functions, and considering that such would be well known by those of ordinary skill in the art, it is respectfully submitted that changes to the drawings are not needed in the present instance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS AND PRIOR ART

In Section 4 of the Office Action, Claims 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,939,888 to Katz et al. ("Katz"). Claim 24 has been amended, as above, and is believed allowable over the Katz reference.

Figure 8 of the Katz reference shows a paper web processing device where a paper web 134 is slit into a plurality of ribbons 143, 145, 147, 148. The ribbons are subsequently angled via turnbars 150, 151, 157 so that the ribbons lie superposed, *i.e.*, one above the other in a stack, for cutting by a cutter 164. However, in the Katz apparatus the printing on the web itself must be specially arranged (*e.g.*, staggered) so that the superposed ribbons contain the desired aligning printed materials. In other words, in Katz the turnbars are not configured so that each ribbon has the same path length. This is specifically noted in Katz, where it is stated that "[t]he layout on the web is such that the ultimate arrangement of the desired products ... are arranged on the web printing format...." Col. 6, lines 24-31. This can also be seen in Figure 8 by comparing the path length of the ribbon 147 to the path length of all the other ribbons 143, 145, 148, *i.e.*, the path length of the ribbon 147 is much shorter than the path length of the other ribbons.

In the present invention, on the other hand, the web processing device is configured so that the path lengths of all the ribbons are substantially the same. This results in laterally adjacent portions of the paper web, *e.g.*, A1 and A2, being superposed for cutting, which thereby enables a more simplified printing arrangement (as opposed to Katz, where non laterally adjacent portions, *e.g.*, A1 and A4, would lie superposed).

To emphasize this difference, Claim 24 has been amended to make it clear that the take up roller duplicates the path length of the second ribbon, relative to the first ribbon, so that laterally adjacent portions of the paper web (which form laterally adjacent portions of the ribbons once the paper web is slit) lie superposed for simultaneous cutting. This is not the case in Katz, where ribbon path lengths are not duplicated for superposing laterally adjacent portions of the paper web/ribbons.

As the Examiner is aware, for a prior art reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), each and every element and limitation of the claim must be found in the prior art reference. Here, the Katz patent does not show a device where a take up roller duplicates ribbon path lengths for superposing ribbons for simultaneous cutting of laterally adjacent portions, as recited in Claim 24. Accordingly, Claim 24 is believed not to be anticipated by Katz, and, therefore, allowable.

It should also be noted that although Katz discloses the use of turnbars, it does not disclose wrapping a ribbon around the turnbar for laterally shifting the ribbon, as recited in Claim 24 by way of the present amendment. In particular, in Katz the ribbons are angled or turned slightly, but they are not laterally shifted, *i.e.*, shifted for travel in generally the same direction.

Claim 25 is believed allowable as depending from an allowable base claim, namely, Claim 24.

In Section 7 of the Office Action, Claims 24-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz. Claims 27 and 28 have been cancelled. Claims 24-26 are believed not to be obvious in light of Katz because there is no teaching in Katz of a take up roller for duplicating ribbon path length for superposing adjacent portions of the paper web for simultaneous cutting, as recited in Claim 24, and because such a feature is not shown in the other prior art references of record and / or is not well known to those with ordinary skill in the art, in such a manner or nature as would provide motivation to produce the recited combination.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 29-31 are newly added. New Claims 29 and 30 (the former depending from Claim 24, the latter an independent claim) relate to the embodiment of the present invention discussed starting at Page 7, line 5.

There, the take up mechanism for duplicating the path length of the first ribbon relative to the second (of the path of the second ribbon relative to the first, as characterized in the claims) comprises a lower take up roller and an upper take up roller. The ribbon is wrapped around the lower take up roller and then around the upper take up roller, and the two rollers are biased apart for tensioning the ribbon. Also, one or both of the take up rollers is horizontally adjustable, to increase or decrease the effective path length of the ribbon, while minimizing the height of the apparatus (*i.e.*, horizontal adjustment, as opposed to vertical adjustment, allows for changing the path length without adding to the clearance height required for the device). This is done solely for adjusting the path length of the ribbon, without shifting or angling the ribbon, and such a feature is recited in the claims (*e.g.*, the take up rollers being positioned perpendicularly with respect to the direction of travel of the ribbon). No such feature is shown or suggested in Katz.

New Claim 31 is generally similar to Claim 24, but characterizes the invention in a slightly different sense. In particular, whereas in Katz most of the ribbons are angled upwards and outwards and then back inwards and downwards for superposition, without adjustment for path length, in the present invention there are two elements/ features for achieving superposition in an improved manner: a “straight-path” ribbon whose path length is adjusted by a take-up roller without shifting or angling the ribbon; and one or more turnbar rollers whose job is to laterally shift the other ribbons into superposition with the straight-path ribbon. This is characterized in Claim 31 by it being recited that: (i) the take-up roller is perpendicular to the second ribbon for path length adjustment without shifting or angling the second ribbon; and (ii) the turnbar roller is configured to laterally shift the first ribbon. No such configuration is shown or suggested in Katz.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the present case is in a condition for allowance, and the Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance at this time.

As Applicant has addressed every rejection raised by the Examiner, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider any applicable claim rejections and pass Claims 24-26 and 29-31 to issue.

If any extensions of time are required to file the present Response, it is requested that this paper be considered a petition there for.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees under 37 CFR 1.17(a) to (d), which may be required to Deposit Account No. 13-0235.

Respectfully submitted,

By John A. Kramer
John A. Kramer
Registration No. 46,302
Attorney For Applicant

McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
(860) 549-5290 x1021